

CPSA § (b)(1) Cleared
29/10/94
Noted, Reviewed or
Produced by
Reviewed by
Reviewed by
Reviewed by

**LOG OF MEETING
DIRECTORATE FOR EPIDEMIOLOGY**

SUBJECT: Ground Fault Circuit Interrupters (GFCIs)

DATE OF MEETING: September 13, 1994

PLACE OF MEETING: Underwriters Laboratories, Melville, NY

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Carolyn Meiers, EPHF

COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Carolyn Meiers, EPHF

NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Nelson Bonilla, Bryant Electric
John Konz, UL
Howard Leopold, Eagle Electric
John Misencik, Bryant Electric
Bill Rose, Hubbell, Inc.

Saul Rosenbaum, Leviton
Thomas Packard, Pass &
Seymour
Stephen Vastagh, NEMA
Henry Zylstra, Square D

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

This was a brief ad hoc NEMA committee meeting to discuss contract proposals to develop generic installation instructions for GFCIs. Saul Rosenbaum chaired the meeting. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that John Konz from UL and Carolyn Meiers from CPSC were present as outside liaison members. Mr. Rosenbaum further stated that the structure of NEMA prevented liaison members from having a direct influence in the final decision making process. It was explained that the project to design generic GFCI instructions is to be sponsored and funded by NEMA and NEMA would make the ultimate decisions for this project.

Mr. Rosenbaum had a number of proposals for the committee to review. The sources for the proposals came from a list of contractors associated with a previous project to develop warnings on extension cords. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that these proposals were considered to be preliminary attempts to identify contractors for the project and that other contractors could be suggested by the committee members.

Mr. Vastagh documented the advantages and disadvantages of the proposals as the committee members reviewed and commented on them. Mr. Vastagh also made lists of factors to be considered when designing the instructions and requirements that would be included when seeking a second round of proposals.

The committee highlighted one proposal that most closely met the needs of the project. The possibility of an on-site visit to this particular contractor was discussed.

The committee decided to refine and rewrite the requirements for the proposal based on suggestions elicited during discussions and recorded by Mr. Vastagh. The requirements would then be given to the contractor of choice and one or two others to further expand on their capability of performance.

CPSC was asked if the video tapes from its usability testing of GFCIs could be cleared and made available to the contractor chosen for the NEMA project. Mr. Rosenbaum wanted to know if the tapes could be cleared in a month so work on the project could proceed expeditiously. Ms. Meiers indicated that she would work to clear both the CPSC's contractor's report on usability test and the video tapes in that time period.

Mr. Rosenbaum said that once the CPSC materials were cleared NEMA would be ready to put a letter ballot before the industry to approve funding for the project.